



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,627	02/25/2004	Christopher E. Bales	ORACL-01381US0	3071
23910	7590	10/14/2009	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP			TRAN, TUYETLIEN T	
650 CALIFORNIA STREET				
14TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			2179	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/14/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OFFICEACTIONS@FDML.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/786,627	BALES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUYETLIEN T. TRAN	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17,33-66 and 69-74 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-17,33-66 and 69-74 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed 07/08/09.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1-17, 33-66, 69-74 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 33, 50 and 70 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 9, 38, 41, 55, 58 are objected to because of the following informalities: the term "the at least one of resources" lacks antecedent basis in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. **Claims 1-11, 13-17, 33-43, 45-60, 62-66, 69-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haber et al. (US 20040254884 A1; hereinafter Haber) in view of Cohen et al. (Patent No. US 7310677 B1; hereinafter Cohen).**

As to claim 1, Haber discloses:

A computer-implemented interactive tool that can configure a portal (e.g., see Fig. 2 and [0022], [0023]; portal objects can be arranged using user's interface), comprising:

- a microprocessor (e.g., see Fig. 1 and [0022]);
- a first user interface operable to manage the portal, wherein the portal contains at least one portlet to display one or more contents of a plurality of contents in a content repository (e.g., see Fig. 3 and [0023]-[0027], [0045]-[0049]; page editor is used when new page or other objects in the portal are created or edited);
- a second user interface operable to manage personalization of the portal (e.g., see Fig. 4C and [0023]; portal objects can be arranged using user's interface); wherein the second user interface displays a content selector hierarchy that contains a plurality of content selector (e.g., Fig. 4A and [0023], [0026]; the portal object repository containing portal object), wherein the at least one portlet is associated with a selected content selector from the plurality of content selector (e.g., see Fig. 4A; portal object directory includes iView object - interpreted as portlet);

While Haber suggests that each content selector of the plurality of content selectors can cause different content to be displayed on the at least one portlet on run time (e.g., see [0004]; wherein portal pages can be setup and customized for each user), Haber does not expressly teach wherein each content selector can cause different content to be displayed based on dynamic evaluation of personalization rules.

In the same field of portal customization, Cohen teaches rule-based customization of a portal (e.g., see col. 1 lines 55-63). Cohen teaches a repository framework that manages the contents in folders or tree structure (e.g., see col. 6 lines 35-45). Particularly, Cohen teaches customization of a portal wherein different content to be displayed based on dynamic evaluation of personalization rules (e.g., see Figs. 3B, 3C, col. 2 lines 12-19, col. 6 lines 51-58; wherein the

behavior of portal page is based on personalization rules; the behavior of portal page includes what information is displayed).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have modified the portal customization system as taught by Haber to include the customization portal based on customization rule as taught by Cohen to achieve the claimed invention. One would have been motivated to make such a combination is to better organize, store and process data (e.g., see Cohen col. 1 lines 46-48) and to allow for easy customization of certain components in the portal system (e.g., see Cohen col. 7 lines 16-18).

As to claim 33, claim 33 reflects the method-comprising method steps for performing the features as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 50, claim 50 reflects the machine readable medium-comprising instructions for performing the features as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 70, Haber discloses:

An interactive tool that can configure a portal (e.g., see Fig. 2 and [0022], [0023]; portal objects can be arranged using user's interface), comprising:

a first user interface operable to manage the portal (e.g., see Fig. 3 and [0023]-[0027], [0045]-[0049]; page editor is used when new page or other objects in the portal are created or edited);

a second user interface operable to manage personalization of the portal for at least one portal resource (e.g., see Fig. 4C and [0023]; portal objects can be arranged using user's interface),

a content management user interface operable to manage content in a virtual content repository (VCR), wherein the VCR is a hierarchical representation of a plurality of individual

Art Unit: 2179

content repositories such that the plurality of individual content repositories appear and behave as a single content repository (e.g., see 4A and [0025], [0026]; multiple repositories in a federated fashion);

wherein the portal includes a desktop that includes at least one of: a book, a page, a portlet, a shell, a look and feel, and a layout (e.g., see [0023], [0049]; portal snippets – iViews object);

and wherein the interactive tool runs on at least one processor (e.g., see Fig. 1 and [0022]).

Haber does not teach the personalization of the portal is adapted to deliver personalized content to a user based on one or more criteria using at least one placeholder, wherein the at least one placeholder is associated with a placeholder definition in natural language phrases.

In the same field of portal customization, Cohen teaches the personalization of the portal is adapted to deliver personalized content to a user based on one or more criteria using at least one placeholder (e.g., see col. 2 lines 20-36; set of condition that determines which portal desktop having portal themes are assigned to end users at runtime). Cohen teaches wherein the at least one placeholder is associated with a placeholder definition in natural language phrases (e.g., see Figs. 3A-3C, col. 2 lines 1-36, col. 6 lines 51-58, col. 7 lines 4-35; wherein conditions are selected to be changed to new values).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make such a combination for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1 above.

As to claims 2, 34 and 51, Haber further discloses at least one user interface operable to manage one of: a desktop, a book, a page, a portlet, a shell, a look and feel, and a layout (e.g., see [0023], [0049]; portal snippets – iViews object).

As to claims 3, 35 and 52, Cohen teaches the portal contains a desktop that can be defined based on a template (e.g., see col. 2 lines 20-36; wherein a portal desktop includes selected framework pages with portal theme). Thus, combining Haber, Cohen would meet the claimed limitations for the advantage of allowing the ability to customize portal pages while still conforming to consistent user interface feature.

As to claims 4, 36 and 53, Cohen teaches the portal contains a desktop that is a user-specific view of a portal (e.g., see col. 2 lines 20-36). Thus, combining Haber, Cohen would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons set forth in claim 1 above.

As to claims 5, 37 and 54, Haber teaches a third user interface operable to define and/or manage a desktop (e.g., see [0023], [0049]; portal template) and wherein the third user interface can render a preview of the desktop (e.g., see [0095]-[0096]).

In addition, Cohen further teaches a third user interface operable to define and/or manage a desktop (e.g., see col. 2 lines 20-36). Thus, combining Haber, Cohen would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

As to claims 6, 38 and 55, Haber further discloses the portal can be depicted graphically as a hierarchy of the at least one portal resources (e.g., see Fig. 4A and [0026]).

As to claims 7, 39 and 56, Haber further discloses the first user interface includes a context-sensitive editor (e.g., see Figs. 4A, 4B and [0019], [0028], [0029]).

As to claims 8, 40 and 57, Haber further discloses the first user interface includes a hierarchy browser (e.g., see Fig. 4A and [0024], [0026], [0030], [0056]).

As to claims 9, 41 and 58, Haber further discloses an entitlement determines what capabilities are available to a portal visitor for the at least one resources (e.g., Figs. 3, 4B, 4C and [0029], [0033]; role editor). Cohen further teaches this feature in Fig. 3B. Thus, combining Haber, Cohen would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

As to claims 10, 42 and 59, Haber further discloses an entitlement is based on a user role (e.g., see Fig. 4B and [0029]; role editor).

As to claims 11, 43 and 60, Haber further discloses a third user interface operable to manage content (e.g., see Fig. 4A); and wherein content is part of a virtual content repository (VCR) (e.g., see 4A and [0024]).

As to claims 13, 45 and 62, Haber further discloses the at least one portlet can dynamically present content (e.g., see [0022]; runtime).

As to claims 14, 46 and 63, Haber further teaches a fourth user interface operable to manage entitlements for at least one portal resource (e.g., see Fig. 3, 4B, [0027]-[0030]; role editor); and wherein an entitlement determines what capabilities are available to a portal visitor for the at least one resources (e.g., see [0029], [0030], [0033]).

As to claims 15, 47 and 64, Haber further discloses the second user interface is operable to manage a content placeholder (e.g., see Fig. 4A and [0023], [0049]; template).

As to claims 16, 48 and 65, Haber further discloses the second user interface is operable to manage a content selector (e.g., see Fig. 4A, [0023]-[0026], [0049]).

As to claims 17, 49 and 66, Haber teaches a fifth user interface operable to manage delegated administration (e.g., see [0028], [0047]).

As to claim 69, Cohen teaches the personalization rules for each of the plurality of content selectors contains natural language phrases that are editable using a context-sensitive editor, wherein the context-sensitive editor allows a user to change any pre-selected highlighted phrase in the personalization rules for each content selector (e.g., see Figs. 3A-3C, col. 2 lines 1-36, col. 6 lines 51-58, col. 7 lines 4-35; wherein conditions are selected to be changed to new values). Thus, combining Haber and Cohen would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

As to claim 71, Haber teaches a context-sensitive editor that allows a user to define and edit one or more placeholder (e.g., see Fig. 4A and [0023], [0030], [0049]; template). Cohen teaches the one or more placeholder describe the placeholder definition for the placeholder, wherein the context-sensitive editor allows a user to select one or more highlighted natural phrases in the one or more placeholder rules and to assign different predefined values to the one or more highlighted natural phrases (e.g., see Figs. 3A-3C, col. 2 lines 1-36, col. 6 lines 51-58, col. 7 lines 4-35; wherein conditions are selected to be changed to new values). Thus, combining Haber and Cohen would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

As to claim 72, Cohen teaches the placeholder definition uses a plurality of user segments, wherein each one of the plurality of user segments provides dynamic classification of users based on one or more criteria (e.g., see Figs. 5A, 5B). Thus, combining Haber and Cohen would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

As to claim 73, Haber teaches a user interface to display a hierarchy of the plurality of user segments (e.g., see Figs. 4A and 4B). Cohen teaches wherein each of the plurality of user segments is associated with a user segment definition in natural language phrases that is editable by a context-sensitive editor (e.g., see Figs. 3B, 5A). Thus, combining Haber and Cohen would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

As to claim 74, Haber teaches a user interface to edit a property associated with at least one content in the virtual content repository (VCR), wherein the property is used in the placeholder definition (e.g., Fig. 3 and [0024]; portal objects can be edited).

5. Claims 12, 44, 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haber in view of Cohen further in view of Kusterer et al. (US 2005/0076311 A1; hereinafter Kusterer).

As to claims 12, 44 and 61, Haber and Cohen teach the limitations of claims 11, 43 and 60 for the same reasons set forth above. Haber and Cohen do not teach the third user interface allows a user to modify the VCR by dragging and dropping graphical objects representing VCR nodes. This deficiency is disclosed by Kusterer (e.g., Fig. 7 and [0005], [0031]).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the repository tree browser of Haber and Cohen to include the feature of drag & drop as taught by Kusterer to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to make it easier and convenient for a user to manage the repository by simply dragging and dropping a graphical object from one place to another.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 07/08/09 have been considered but are moot in new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. *In re Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275,277 (CCPA 1968)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

Art Unit: 2179

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. T. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179